DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 803 SO 018 300

AUTHOR Nelson, Murray
TITLE Peace Education: Personal Reflections Amid a Field of Research in School Curriculum.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 15p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Guides; Educational Strategies; Instructional Materials; *International Education; National Defense; *Peace; Secondary Education; Social Studies; United States Government (Course); United States History; *War; World Affairs; World History; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Nuclear Weapons

ABSTRACT

Peace education can be introduced into the curriculum through adoption or development of appropriate materials, networking, development programs at the local level, and workshops for educators, parents, administrators and the general citizenry. A status report on the integration of peace education into the curriculum completed in 1985 by Carole Hahn indicated that nuclear education was being taught in some classrooms. Hahn reported that educators saw a need for (1) quality teacher education in teaching nuclear issues; (2) a curriculum plan appropriate to the student's level of maturity; and (3) a sensible integration of nuclear themes into traditional curricula. Lowry Hemphill examined available materials and found that U.S. history texts had little or nothing on nuclear weapons and the nuclear arms race. Many of the available materials consisted mainly of a collection of worksheets and teacher lesson plans which failed to provide enough background information for students. Two useful curricula are "Nucleography" (Barber, et al., 1982) and "Let's Talk About Peace, Let's Talk About Nuclear War" (Lemoine and Farkas, 1983). Networking for school districts with a beginning attempt at peace education is helpful in acquiring resource and instructional information. Workshops for local educators and citizens can help overcome the resistance that will arise to peace education. (SM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED284803

# PEACE EDUCATION

# PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AMID A FIELD OF RESEARCH IN SCHOOL CURRICULUM

by

Murray Nelson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Murray Nelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO018300

# PEACE EDUCATION
# PERSONAL REFLECTIONS AMID A FIELD OF RESEARCH IN SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Murray Nelson

## Introduction

Who can be against peace? It seems few could be, but when I raised this question with the board of a education "watchdog" group in my local community, most thought it would be seen as a controversial subject and suggested a softened stance on nomenclature; conflict resolution strategies or even global education were seen as less confrontational than peace.

My interest in this topic grew out of my combined study and interest in law and anthropology. Thus, conflict resolution, particularly cross cultural conflict resolution was of significant interest to me. With that in mind, I taught a course on the topic at our local alternative high school. This raised questions in my mind regarding the cultural baggage that we bring to the way we resolve our difference.

In the fall of 1983 I was fortunate enough to be a Fulbright Senior Lecturer at the University of Iceland and was able to pursue my interest in conflict resolution and peace education on two fronts. First I tested the responses of a small number of Icelandic children (10-12) to a brief questionnaire regarding approximate action in potential conflict situations. The same instrument had been administered to an equal number of American youngsters.

Second I was able to encourage a group of students in one of my classes at the University of Iceland to research and write a paper on peace education from an Icelandic perspective. They were able to read and include works from Icelandic, Norwegian and Danish scholars on peace education that had not been translated into English. Their paper greatly improved my understanding of peace education.

## Defining Peace Education

Johan Galtung, a Norwegian who founded the Institute for Peace Education in Oslo in 1966 distinguishes between two different conceptualizations of peace of non-violence and justice or harmony. He expands these into a larger taxonomy.

> The distinction between these two types of peace gives rise to a fourfold classification of relations between two nations: war, which is organized group violence; negative peace, where there is no violence but no form of interaction either and where the best characterization is "peaceful coexistence"; positive peace, where there is some cooperation interspread with occasional outbreaks of violence; and unqualified peace where absence of violence is combined with a pattern of cooperation. (Galtung, 29).

Due to the contradictory nature of the term, "negative peace", some observers prefer to use the term "passive peace" while calling the more positive identification "active peace." (Abbs reinforces a more positive view of peace - See I-1)

Similarly, there are varying definitions of peace education which can be traced to the failure to define peace satisfactorily. As Heimo Hantynen notes,

> If there is no clear understanding of what peace is, there can be no clear understanding of what peace education should be. (Hantynen, 25)

Peace education has been burdened not only by the lack of concensus as to the definitions of peace and peace education. In addition many other types of educational issues have been promoted as similar or parallel. Despite the legitimacy of these areas of concern, their sheer presence has combined to make peace education inclusive and complex enough to con some from venturing into the issues. These areas include nuclear education, disarmament education, nuclear arms education, conflict resolution education, global education and international education (among others).

The excellent and well known issues on this topic from Teachers College Record (Fall, 1982) and Harvard Education Review (August, 1984) were entitled respectively, "Education for Peace and Disarmament: Toward a Living World" and

"Education and the Threat of Nuclear War". Both were as concerned with nuclear war and disarmament as with the positive, unqualified peace Galtung aspires to reach. Nuclear educators include aspects of nuclear power in their attempts at an informed (and often nuclear free) world community. Conflict resolution focuses on both the people to people differences and the larger national or cultural differences that are reflective of those individual differences.

**Theoretical ideas and ideals**

In 1982 the International Review of Education had a special issue on peace education. Though peace education had been in existence as a "movement" since the late 1950's, this was the first widely disseminated volume to be focused entirely on the issue. Much of the focus was (and is today) on peace education in colleges as a course or a program. My concern is with precollege attention or teacher training since that will affect the development of attitudes, most of which are in place before college.

The International Review ... articles were more theoretical and broad based than those appearing in American journals. The presentations are more thoughtful, but the directions and suggestions less evident. Galtung and others specifically eschew "instructions" for peace education, seeing that each group must decide that for itself. "Everyone has to develop his own format; there is no standard format that should be adhered to. That would be contrary to the whole idea." (Marks, 292). Magnus Haavelsrud in his article, "An Introduction to the Debate on Peace Education", echoes similar sentiments although he does suggest major themes for peace education. These include racism, sexism, imperialism, militarism, and ageism. (Haavelsrud, 246). Galtung in his article only goes so far as to suggest that, "general insight into how conflicts emerge, and their dynamics and possible resolution, should be of significance to everybody, at all levels, in all areas of society." (Galtung, 1982, 282). Marks proposes four points to be examined that build

on one another starting with development and moving through conflict, peace and culminating in "project(ing) all of this on the screen of the future analyzing trends, making proposals for action" (Marks, 292-293).

Burns and Aspeslagh examined six concepts of peace education for study that were adapted from Bartheld. These were:

1) an emphasis on the atrocious side of violence, particularly war
2) an emphasis on decreasing the potential for aggression
3) an emphasis on conflict as the core of peace education. Peace education should provide people with the skills to handle conflict.
4) prejudice and images of the enemy
5) the international system - the UN, world citizenship
6) power, influence and change - a set of goals, not a guide to content (Burns & Aspeslagh, 317).

Pikas asserts that peace education should be taught dialectically beginning with awareness which he calls "sounding the alarm" (the thesis), progressing to identifying causes (antithesis) and culminating in what he refers to as symmetric peace education (synthesis) where "peace can be achieved only by cooperation between the parties which are threatening or afraid of each other." (Pikas, 334). This would come about if "both sides" had peace education materials in common. Though an ideal goal, Pikas's idea has merit particularly for Europe.

Also in 1982 the Teachers College Record had Education for Peace and Disarmament as a theme issue. Maxine Greene offered a rationale for teaching peace through the arts, but there was little real focus for doing peace education in schools other than Richard Barnett's article, "Teaching Peace". Barnett advocated such instruction being begun before high school, focusing not only on the data of the arms race, but what to make of it. He also advocated study of the Soviet Union in order to better the prospects of peaceful coexistence. More than facts filled Barnett's prospective course(s); creativity was another key component. "Teaching peace requires familiarizing students not only with a range of practical disarmament ideas, but also with the extensive literature on creative nonviolence." (Barnett, 36). Harvard Education Review's special issue on "Education and the threat of Nuclear

War" (1984) again had more thoughtful, philosophical assessments of the issue but also included a section entitled "Chronicles" by individual classroom teachers on their experiences w/peace education. Tizard's article discussed physicians' and psychiatrists' research on nuclear issues and children's knowledge of such issues. She noted most of the research was quite limited methodologically, but still seemed to indicate widespread anxiety in the U. S. Britain, Sweden, Finland and the Soviet Union among pre adolescents and adolescents. (Few studies have been done on children under 10). Tizard also noted, however, that "Claims for a corrosive and malignant effect on the young are contradicted by Northern Ireland demographic data." (Tizard, 277). That is, crime among young people had not risen, educational standards (among the highest in Europe) had remained high and neither truancy nor referrals for child problems had increased amidst the years of violence and destruction in Northern Ireland.

Support for peace studies has been more pronounced in Europe where they are truly in the middle of potential conflict between the superpowers. West Germany, Belgium and England have been evident in the concerns for peace education, but significantly, not France. In Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland where compromise is highly valued and where the Soviets are as close or closer than western allies, peace education has found leadership and strength. A small survey by Smoker (1983) found agreement among British educators in the topics of peace studies in British schools.

In the Eastern bloc, Romanian and Czechoslovakian educators have written on peace efforts. A 1984 volume contained a number of papers and bibliographies on education for peace in Czechoslovakia (Faktorove, et al, 1984). In that the authors cited the UNESCO Recommendations and the resolution of the World Assembly for Peace and Life Against Nuclear War as being of exceptional importance (Faktorove, 11). The peace education bibliography also explained the need for such teaching in

all subject areas, including art and music (as Maxine Greene would agree with) which "are particularly useful to foster peace with the rich traditions of peace motifs in these subjects." (Faktorove, 77).

There are the beginnings of peace education in some Asian Nations like Japan. In New Zealand a proposed school program of peace studies has sparked political controversy because the government has been accused of politicizing the issue to further its ban on port visits by nuclear-armed and nuclear-powered ships. "A recent poll conducted by the New Zealand government revealed that 81 percent of the population supports the concept of teaching 'conflict resolution' in the public schools." (Salzman, 30). The pollster felt, however, that if the word "peace" had been used, the level of public support might have been lower.

**Status in Schools**

Much has been written about philosophical support for the concept of peace education in schools. The translation of that has been uneven geographically and in depth of coverage. Many of the materials used in school are practical and come from a variety of sources. Carole Hahn did a status report that appeared in 1985 which was tiered, sampling state social studies consultants, social studies supervisors and a small number of teachers who voluntarily returned a questionnaire.

Hahn reported that supervisors felt nuclear education was being taught in, at most, some classrooms, mostly embedded in Issues or Problems Courses. They also felt teachers did not teach these issues primarily because of their own lack of knowledge, their own discomfort with the topic or the unavailibility of materials.

Teachers and supervisors agreed that the greatest need is to have balanced, clear materials to allow students to form their own opinions. Despite recognizing that criticism is not unlikely, the educators also saw needs for 1) quality teacher education on teaching nuclear issues 2) a curriculum plan appropriate to the students' level of maturity and 3) sensible integration of nuclear themes into traditional curricula.

Hahn also interviewed nine teachers in depth of this teaching and found that, "The saddest tones heard in the interviews were when those nine teachers described their colleagues' reactions to what they were doing - 'indifference,' 'apathy,' 'disinterest' were the words they used to describe other teachers' reactions." (Hahn, 253).

The most frequently cited, widely available materials cited include "Choices," a series of 10 lessons for the junior high school available through the NEA; "Decision Making in a Nuclear Age," a one semester course geared for tenth grade, approximately; "Crossroads," designed primarily to understand the nuclear threat and for high school use; and "Day of Dialogue" produced by Educators for Social Responsibility with K-College usage possibilities.

Lowry Hemphill examined these and other Materials in 1984. She concluded, not surprisingly, that U. S. history texts have little or nothing one nuclear weapons and nuclear build up. "Choices" she noted had two themes 1) the dangers posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and 2) the advantages of conflict resolution techniques for settling differences among individuals and nations. She had reservations about this curriculum, however.

> Much (of it) has the unfortunate aura of heavy-handed adult moralizing. ....(It) may leave students feeling that opposition to nuclear weapons must be predicated on pacificism in daily life, or that the horrors of nuclear war in some sense represent a logical development from children's own squabbles. (Hemphill, 360).

"Crossroads," like "Choices" consists mainly of a collection of worksheets and teacher lesson plans and these fail to provide enough background information for students. This is also a problem for "Day of Dialogue" according to Hemphill. (Hemphill, 361). "Crossroads" had grown out of a Jobs with Peace Campaign in

Boston and was developed for use in the Boston public schools. The focus was on the loss of services due to a loss of funds for domestic programs such as roads, housing, transportation, crime prevention, health care, sanitation, fire protection and unemployment (Greely, et.al). Despite its use in whole or part in 30 states, the program had grown out of local concerns and the criticism of Hemphill seems valid once the Curriculum "outgrew" its borders.

Hahn found that the most frequently used materials were teacher made units. In this controversial topic many have found this approach to be the most rewarding and meaningful to students and teachers. Many "National" materials are produced with the intention that they will be modified to meet local concerns. Creative Conflict Solving for Kids, grades 4-9 is basically generic focusing more on process and skills than content. Techniques include modeling, mediation, problem-solving, brainstorming, role playing, visualization, body movement and integration of conflict-resolution concepts. (Schmidt and Friedman, 1).

The two geographic areas that have produced the most materials are the Boston area on the East coast and the San Francisco Bay area on the west coast. "Choices" was jointly produced by the NEA, the Massachusetts Teachers Association and the Cambridge based union of concerned Scientists. "Day of Dialogue" came from Educators for Social Responsibility (also Boston based) and Decision-Making in a Nuclear Age" developed from work done in two districts in suburban Boston, just to name a few. Charlotte Waterlow discussed her twelfth grade elective course on peace in Cambridge in HER.

Two useful curricula from the Bay Area are Nucleography produced in Berkeley (1982) and Let's Talk About Peace, Let's Talk About Nuclear War from Bananas (1983). Nucleography (Barber, et. al,) an annotated resource guide for parents and educators on nuclear energy, war and peace materials from the 1970's and early 1980's. It consists of eight chapters, including curricular materials, audio visual resources, books for children, informational materials and organizations.

Let's Talk About Peace... by Lemoine and Farkas evolved from concerns of East Bay parents who expressed a need for help to the East Bay Child Care Referral Service. The Curriculum is for children grades 1-8 and consists of learning activities on issues concerning nuclear war and disarmament. There are seven units of study

1) Expressing Thoughts and feelings
2) What Makes an Enemy
3) Peace as a Process
4) A History of Non Violence
5) War and Nuclear Facts
6) Survival of the Cooperative: Examples of Cooperation in Nature and Society
7) Action and Empowerment: Current Anti Nuclear Projects.

There is an extensive bibliography which includes many of the materials previously discussed in this paper.

An excellent locally developed course is described in Zola and Zola's volume. The peace education components of the Milwaukee Public Schools Peace Studies Resolution as well as high school and elementary program ideas are in the Appendix.

Other places with local commitments to peace education include San Francisco, Pittsburgh, New York City, Dade County (Miami) and Madison with nuclear age education initiations introduced in the state legislatures of Connecticut, California, Maine and Oregon. Maine has even created an educational clearing house on Nuclear Issues in the Department of Educational Services.

Directions and Conclusions

Peace Education is still often shrouded in shadow, forced to use subterfuge to promulgate its message. In my conclusions I would like to assuage my guilt by discussing what I do, what can be done and what needs to be done to ensure peace.

Besides the work in Iceland and the local high school, I have introduced the concept of peace education into my secondary social studies methods class. When I told the students of this component of the class, their reaction was similar to those found by Hahn in her survey, that is fear, uncertainty and, at best, indifference. This was based on their ignorance and the basic amorphorousness of the topic. Once we refined that through their readings and our discussions, things got better.

They each wrote two short papers on peace education and were required to develop components of their required unit that accentuated the concepts of peace. Many of these offerings presented peace as an alternative to war in historical perspective. One looked at Early Civilizations and sought to find why conflict developed in early city states. That was then to be compared to the present in seeking why it is in the interest of countries to cooperate with each other. One study developed ideas to study the peace movement that arose after World War I.

A number of students commented at the end of the semester that they had moved from indifference or negativism to positivism. Peace education was necessary and defensible in the secondary curriculum.

My experiences may not be unique and my class was surely not. Any methods professor can and should introduce the concepts of peace education into their class. merely assigning readings such as those discussed or other articles that have appeared in journals such as Social Education, The Social Studies, Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappa and Education Digest will result in initial or increased awareness which creates converts. Indeed that must be what we seek, converts to a cause that crosses all national, cultural and religious borders.

In a way methods classes professors have it easier; they have relative autonomy and their students can read and use materials at any level. The large and growing peace studies curricula at many colleges enhances that which can be done with pre or inservice teachers on this topic.

School materials are available, but they have to be pursued. Lemoine and Farkas note that publishers avoid this topic and we have a responsibility to teach it. Peace education can be introduced to school curricula more so than now but work is necessary.

There is a great need for networking. Clearly there is evidence of some of this but it is usually limited to the most active peace organizations. School districts with a beginning attempt at peace education could plug into a network like the clearinghouse at the Maine Department of Education Services. Computer linkages are not only common, they are vital. If financial support is needed, computer companies could be approached for start up and basic maintenance costs.

Local development of programs is needed. A local organization of educators and parents should be formed to aid in curriculum work and to lobby local school districts to start peace education programs. Use of the local media both print and broadcast is possible. Local public access broadcasting time is available through many radio and television stations. Most cable companies need to provide a public access channel. These should be exploited to make the public aware of peace education.

Workshops should be sponsored by educators and parents for educators, parents, administrators and general citizenry. We know why teachers avoid peace education; thus we can gear workshops to overcome the resistance that we know will arise in some form.

Finally, this group, the SSEC should consider a conference in the future focusing on peace and hope to make it once again international in scope. A fitting locale would be the Institute for Peace Education in Oslo or in Cambridge if the focus is to be limited to the U. S..

No one of us can do enough for the cause of continuing peace. Just as teachers stated, we must overcome the potential barbs of colleagues as we recognize an issue far greater than ourselves.

## References

Abbs, Peter. "Teachers, Ethical Imagination and World Disarmament," Teachers College Record, Vol. 84, No. 1, Fall, 1982. p.183.

Barber, J., Et. al. Nucleargraphy: An Annotated Bibliography for Parents and Educators on Nuclear Energy, War and Peace, Berkeley, CA, Nucleargraphy, 1982.

Barnett, Richard. "Teaching Peace," Teacher's College Record, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1984, pp. 271-281.

Burns, Robin and Robert Aspeslagh. "Concepts of Peace Education: A View of Western Experience." International Review of Education, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1982, pp. 311-330.

Faktorove, L., R. Hrichova, P. Lipertova, Editors. Education for Peace, Supplement No. 17 to Information Bulletin of Sectional Information Centre, Prague, 1984. Ed 267-887.

Galtung, Johan. Peace Research-Education Action: Essays in Peace Research, Vol. I, Copenhagen, Christian Ejlers, 1975.

Galtung, Johan. "Peace Education: Learning to Hate War, Love Peace, and Do Something About it," International Review of Education, Vol 29, No. 3, 1982, pp. 281-287.

Greely, Kathy, Susan Markowitz and Carol Rank. "Education for Peace and Justice," Howard Education Review, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1984, pp. 342-347.

Haavelsrud, Magnus. "An Introduction to the Debate on Peace Education," International Review of Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1982. pp. 281-287.

Hahn, Carole. "The Status of Nuclear Education in Social Studies: Report of a Survey," Social Studies, Vol. 76, Nov/Dec 1985, pp. 254-56.

Hemphill, Lowry. "Curriculum Responses to the Threat of Nuclear War," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1984. pp. 358-363.

Lemoine, J. and R. Farkas. Let's Talk About Peace, Let's Talk About Nuclear War. A Peace Curriculum for Teaching in a Nuclear Age, Bananas, Berkeley, CA, 1983.

Marks, Stephen, "Peace, Development, Disarmament and Human Rights Education: The Dilemma Between the Status Quo and Curriculum Overload," International Review of Education, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1982, pp. 289-310.

Marquand, Robert. "Teaching for Peace," Education supplement of The Christian Science Monitor, January 31, 1986.

Pikas, Anatol. "Symmetric Peace Education and UNESCO's Potential for Promoting it," International Review of Education, Vol. 29, No. 3, 1982, pp. 331-343.

Salzman, Jason, "New Zealand 'peace studies'," The Christian Science Monitor, April 1, 1987, pp. 27 and 30.

Schmidt, Fran and Alice Friedman. Creative Conflict-Solving for Kids Grades 4-9, 2d, Abrams Peace Education, Foundation, Miami, 1985.

Tizard, Barbara. Problematic Aspects of Nuclear Education," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 54, No. 3, 1984, pp. 271-281.

Waterlow, Charlotte, "A Classroom Experiment in Teaching for Peace: Solutions to Global Problems," Harvard Education Review, Vol. 54, No. 3., 1984. pp. 329-333.

Zola, J. and J. Zola. Teaching About Peace and Nuclear War: A Balanced Approach, ERIC/CHESS, SSEC, Boulder, 1985.